

Proceeding: **UNIVERSAL SERVICE** Record 1 of 1
Applicant Name: **R. Scott Gardner**
Proceeding Name: **96-45** Author Name:
Lawfirm Name:
Contact Name: **applicant_name** Contact Email: **sgardner@internetland.net**
Address Line 1: **416 S. Ohio**
Address Line 2:
City: **Sedalia** State: **MO**
Zip Code: **65301** Postal Code: **4410**
Submission Type: **7** Submission Status: **ACCEPTED** Viewing Status: **UNRESTRICTED**
Subject:
DA Number:
Exparte Late Filed: ☐ File Number:
Date Submission: **1/12/98 18:25:55** Date Filed:
Date Rcpt: **1/13/98 00:01:00**
Date Released:
Date Accepted:
Date Disseminated:
Confirmation # **1998112001475**

DOCKET FILE COPY **RECEIVED**

JAN 13 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

INTERNET FILING

96-45

1/13/98

RECEIVED

JAN 13 1998

The contemplated charge in Proceeding 96-45 will lessen competition in the telecommunications industry. The Internet is a viable alternative to traditional telco communication methods, and its use is accelerating rapidly. RBOCS, long-distance carriers and other traditional telco companies are already profiting enormously from the upsurge in traffic in two areas: (1) Increased use of second lines in homes for computer use, which could help pay for modernization of telco lines to fiber optic if idiotic state and federal regulations were eliminated, and (2) large amounts of pure data traffic across long-distance carrier trunk lines.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Classifying Internet Service Providers as telecommunications services will allow those same idiotic federal and state regulatory schemes to be applied to ISP's, which will "help" traditional telephone companies by killing off any ISP competition. We've already seen Southwestern Bell and GTE attempt to kill off any "free" competition here in Missouri with a bill passed by the Missouri legislature in 1997 which prevented cities from selling telecommunications services over their internal fiber-optic networks. The proposal to place universal services charges on ISP's is part and parcel with the telecos' attempt to return us to the golden days of monopoly telecommunications, when AT&T and the Bell System could advertise that "We May Be The Only Telephone Company in Town, But We Try Not To Act Like It."

The Internet does not fit into any formal regulatory scheme right now other than state and federal criminal and antitrust laws. It is the product of a Cold War mentality (survivability of government and military command/control communications capability) married to "flower child" ideas about freedom of information on a global scale. Any attempt to govern it will be highly counterproductive at this point in time, will put a stranglehold on telecommunications competition and will kill off Internet commerce just when it's getting started.

Proceeding: **UNIVERSAL SERVICE** ☒ Record 1 of 1
Applicant Name: **David Waltemate**
Proceeding Name: **96-45** Author Name:
Lawfirm Name:
Contact Name: **applicant_name** Contact Email: **dlw75@midwest.net**
Address Line 1: **3698 Union School Rd.**
Address Line 2:
City: **Chester** State: **IL** ☒
Zip Code: **62233** Postal Code: **3002**
Submission Type: **124** ☒ Submission Status: **ACCEPTED** ☒ Viewing Status: **UNRESTRICTED** ☒
Subject:
DA Number: Exparte Late Filed: ☐ File Number:
Date Submission: **1/13/98 10:06:49** Date Filed: Date Rcpt: **1/13/98 10:17:35**
Date Released: Date Accepted: Date Disseminated:
Confirmation # **1998113219120**

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL
RECEIVED

JAN 13 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

INTERNET FILING

96-45
1/13/98

RECEIVED

JAN 13 1998

I would like to complain about your ruling on long distance co.s getting a default of \$.30 on each call from a payphone to an 800 #. I paid extra to get an 800 # for my pager so my son could call me from a payphone to pick him up. This ruling has made my pager co. block calls from payphones. Now my son has to stand in the cold so the long distance co.s can make a little MORE profit!! I thought the Government was supposed to help the people, not BIG BUSINESS. You are really doing a disservice to the people, and especially to the children, of this country with this ruling aimed at getting MORE PROFIT for RICH phone companies.

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

THANKS A LOT!!!!!!
David Waltemate

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

I am a 22 year old college student. I believe that applying additional charges to ISPs, would make the internet financially out of reach for most home-based users. If these fees go into effect I for one, will be forced to cancel my internet access. I am majoring in electronic engineering, and the net is an invaluable tool in my school work. I could not do without it. Raising the fees or placing a minute fee on to my bill would make my task as a student impossible. Please consider the middle income class when deciding on this case.

To advance as a society, everyone needs low cost access to information tools such as the internet. Taking this away by adding a \$.06/per minute charge would not only make me cancel my internet access, I would probably cancel my telephone also.

Many internet users are intelligent and stay offline as much as possible. If internet usage is causing telephone network bottlenecks, then we should initiate a web-wide campaign to stop email chain letters and internet "porn-downloading". It is THESE services that should have to pay the extra usage fees.

Thank You.
Aaron R. Montgomery
4001 Southpointe
Washington Mo 63090
314-239-3067

RECEIVED

JAN 13 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

INTERNET FILING

96-45
1/13/98

Proceeding: UNIVERSAL SERVICE Record 1 of 1
Applicant Name: Robert S. Riley
Proceeding Name: 96-45 Author Name:
Lawfirm Name:
Contact Name: applicant_name Contact Email: rileymat@sonetcon.com
Address Line 1: 6102 Lincoln Avenue
Address Line 2:
City: Lawton State: OK
Zip Code: 73505 Postal Code: 1319
Submission Type: 7 Submission Status: ACCEPTED Viewing Status: UNRESTRICTED
Subject:
DA Number:
Exparte Late Filed:
File Number:
Date Submission: 1/12/98 20:01:42 Date Filed:
Date Rcpt: 1/13/98 00:01:00
Date Released:
Date Accepted:
Date Disseminated:
Confirmation # 1998112406439

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

JAN 13 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

INTERNET FILING

96-45

1/13/98

I am opposed to the proposal being made by Southwestern Bell and the other Baby Bells that a user fee be levied on Internet customers who gain access to the Internet by means of a local access telephone number. I believe that Southwestern Bell, etc. is a monopoly which needs to be broken up as was ATT in the 1980s. Southwestern Bell should not be allowed to enter the Long Distance market nor should it be permitted to charge fees to Internet users. What Southwestern Bell needs is good, stiff competition to run it out of business! Competition will make Southwestern Bell a more friendly and less arrogant local telephone company and break its monopolistic hold on local telephone service. If I had a choice, I would drop this company in a heartbeat.

I recommend that the Congress and FCC deny Southwestern Bell and the other Baby Bells to gain a stranglehold on Internet users. We already pay enough to this company for its local telephone service. What the telephone industry needs is more competition to bring down the excessive rate charges which exist today.

Robert S. Riley

RECEIVED

JAN 13 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Proceeding: **UNIVERSAL SERVICE** Record 1 of 1
Applicant Name: **R. Scott Gardner**
Proceeding Name: **96-45** Author Name:
Lawfirm Name:
Contact Name: **applicant_name** Contact Email: **sgardner@internetland.net**
Address Line 1: **416 S. Ohio**
Address Line 2:
City: **Sedalia** State: **MO**
Zip Code: **65301** Postal Code: **4410**
Submission Type: **7** Submission Status: **ACCEPTED** Viewing Status: **UNRESTRICTED**
Subject:
DA Number:
Exparte Late Filed: ☐ File Number:
Date Submission: **1/12/98 18:25:55** Date Filed:
Date Rcpt: **1/13/98 00:01:00**
Date Released:
Date Accepted:
Date Disseminated:
Confirmation # **1998112001475**

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

JAN 13 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

INTERNET FILING

96 - 45

1/13/98

RECEIVED

JAN 13 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

The contemplated charge in Proceeding 96-45 will lessen competition in the telecommunications industry. The Internet is a viable alternative to traditional telco communication methods, and its use is accelerating rapidly. RBOCS, long-distance carriers and other traditional telco companies are already profiting enormously from the upsurge in traffic in two areas: (1) Increased use of second lines in homes for computer use, which could help pay for modernization of telco lines to fiber optic if idiotic state and federal regulations were eliminated, and (2) large amounts of pure data traffic across long-distance carrier trunk lines.

Classifying Internet Service Providers as telecommunications services will allow those same idiotic federal and state regulatory schemes to be applied to ISP's, which will "help" traditional telephone companies by killing off any ISP competition. We've already seen Southwestern Bell and GTE attempt to kill off any "free" competition here in Missouri with a bill passed by the Missouri legislature in 1997 which prevented cities from selling telecommunications services over their internal fiber-optic networks. The proposal to place universal services charges on ISP's is part and parcel with the telecoms' attempt to return us to the golden days of monopoly telecommunications, when AT&T and the Bell System could advertise that "We May Be The Only Telephone Company in Town, But We Try Not To Act Like It."

The Internet does not fit into any formal regulatory scheme right now other than state and federal criminal and antitrust laws. It is the product of a Cold War mentality (survivability of government and military command/control communications capability) married to "flower child" ideas about freedom of information on a global scale. Any attempt to govern it will be highly counterproductive at this point in time, will put a stranglehold on telecommunications competition and will kill off Internet commerce just when it's getting started.

Proceeding: **UNIVERSAL SERVICE** Record 1 of 1
Applicant Name: **ECTOR JOE STOCKTON, JR**
Proceeding Name: **96-45** Author Name:
Lawfirm Name:
Contact Name: **applicant_name** Contact Email: **ejs@iland.net**
Address Line 1: **569 NE 13 HWY**
Address Line 2:
City: **WARRENSBURG** State: **MO**
Zip Code: **64093** Postal Code:
Submission Type: **7** Submission Status: **ACCEPTED** Viewing Status: **UNRESTRICTED**
Subject:
DA Number:
Exparte Late Filed:
File Number:
Date Submission: **1/12/98 17:46:00** Date Filed:
Date Rcpt: **1/13/98 00:01:00**
Date Released:
Date Accepted:
Date Disseminated:
Confirmation # **1998112326973**

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL RECEIVED

JAN 13 1998

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

INTERNET FILING

96-45

1/13/98

RECEIVED

JAN 13 1998

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN,

I AM A FAMILY MAN WITH 3 CHILDREN. OUR CHILDREN USE THE INTERNET FOR EDUCATION INFORMATION REGULARLY. IF YOU ALLOW AN INCREASE CHARGE FOR THIS SERVICE, IT WILL CAUSE A HARDSHIP ON MILLIONS OF WORKING PEOPLE. THE MAJOR PHONE COMPANIES WANT TO MAKE EVEN MORE MONEY AND DO NOT LIKE THE IDEA OF INDEPENDENT PROVIDERS. IF THEY HAD THERE WAY, YOU KNOW THEY WOULD LOVE TO HAVE A MONOPOLY AGAIN. THIS MUST NOT BE ALLOWED. IT WILL UNDO ALL THAT HAS BEEN DONE, BREAKING UP THE BELL SYSTEM. IT IS VERY IMPORTANT THAT THE DECISION BE BASED ON YOUR UNDERSTANDING THE REAL MOTIVE.

THANK YOU

JOE STOCKTON

Proceeding: UNIVERSAL SERVICE ☐ Record 1 of 1
Applicant Name: Ronald R. Jernigan
Proceeding Name: 96-45 Author Name:
Lawfirm Name:
Contact Name: applicant_name Contact Email: ronj@megabits.net
Address Line 1: 506 Parkside Place
Address Line 2:
City: Indian Harbour Beach State: FL ☐
Zip Code: 32937 Postal Code: 4809
Submission Type: 7 ☐ Submission Status: ACCEPTED ☐ Viewing Status: UNRESTRICTED ☐
Subject:
DA Number: Ex parte Late Filed: ☐ File Number:
Date Submission: 1/12/98 17:31:35 Date Filed: Date Rcpt: 1/13/98 00:01:00
Date Released: Date Accepted: Date Disseminated:
Confirmation # 1998112823434

DOCKET FILE ~~RECORDED~~

JAN 13 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

INTERNET FILING

96-45
1/13/98

RECEIVED

JAN 13 1998

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

I object to any ruling by the FCC that will result in any
"per minute" charges being levied on individual end-users of any
ISP by any means directly or indirectly.
Ronald R. Jernigan

Proceeding: **UNIVERSAL SERVICE** Record 1 of 1
Applicant Name: **Michael and Cathy Taylor**
Proceeding Name: **96-45** Author Name: **Michael and Cathy Taylor**
Lawfirm Name: _____
Contact Name: **applicant_name** Contact Email: _____
Address Line 1: **121 E. Hunt Ave #106**
Address Line 2: _____
City: **Warrensburg** State: **MO**
Zip Code: **64093** Postal Code: _____
Submission Type: **7** Submission Status: **ACCEPTED** Viewing Status: **UNRESTRICTED**
Subject: _____
DA Number: _____ Exparte Late Filed: ☐ File Number: _____
Date Submission: **1/12/98 17:16:50** Date Filed: _____ Date Rcpt: **1/13/98 00:01:00**
Date Released: _____ Date Accepted: _____ Date Disseminated: _____
Confirmation # **1998112165458**

**DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL
RECEIVED**

JAN 13 1998

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

INTERNET FILING

**96 - 45
1/13/98**

RECEIVED

JAN 13 1998

Attention FCC and Congress: We are avid internet users who are very concerned about the pending issue. Adding per minute fees is clearly unconscionable. The internet is a FREE forum for the exchange of ideas and information. Information exchange should not be restricted to the wealthy. Students, children, and small businesses will be negatively impacted by any additional charges to use the internet above and beyond what Internet Service Providers already charge.

Many people use the internet to find employment, offer employment or other services which are necessary to the functioning of a free market economy. Additional fees will increase the revenue of telephone monopolies at the expense of economic growth, interstate commerce, and the First Amendment.

Please, please do not impose additional fees which will restrict our use of the internet. "If it ain't broken, don't fix it."

Proceeding: **UNIVERSAL SERVICE** ☐ Record 1 of 1
Applicant Name: **Floyd D. Clark**
Proceeding Name: **96-45** Author Name:
Lawfirm Name:
Contact Name: **applicant_name** Contact Email: **clark@cmsu1.cmsu.edu**
Address Line 1: **801 S Main #7**
Address Line 2:
City: **Warrensburg** State: **MO**
Zip Code: **64093** Postal Code:
Submission Type: **7** Submission Status: **ACCEPTED** Viewing Status: **UNRESTRICTED**
Subject:
DA Number: Exparte Late Filed: ☐ File Number:
Date Submission: **1/12/98 20:06:29** Date Filed: Date Rcpt: **1/13/98 00:01:00**
Date Released: Date Accepted: Date Disseminated:
Confirmation # **1998112376593**

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

INTERNET FILING

96-45
1/13/98

RECEIVED

JAN 13 1998

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

CC Docket No. 96-45 (Report to Congress)
Leave it alone. The system is working fine just the way it is.
I've been using the internet since you had to know how to type and
it's been fine until the lawyers got into the act.

RECEIVED

JAN 13 1998

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

This is all about the 'poor abused phone companies' losing business. I don't remember seeing anything in the constitution about guaranteeing anyone's profit margin. They will just have to learn to compete on a level playing field rather than pricing all of the other ISP's out of business.

Proceeding: **UNIVERSAL SERVICE** Record 1 of 1
Applicant Name: **Bruce Bryant**
Proceeding Name: **96-45** Author Name:
Lawfirm Name:
Contact Name: **applicant_name** Contact Email:
Address Line 1: **1015 Edgewood Drive**
Address Line 2:
City: **Sedalia** State: **MO**
Zip Code: **65301** Postal Code:
Submission Type: **7** Submission Status: **ACCEPTED** Viewing Status: **UNRESTRICTED**
Subject:
DA Number:
Exparte Late Filed:
File Number:
Date Submission: **1/12/98 22:26:16** Date Filed:
Date Rcpt: **1/13/98 00:01:00**
Date Released:
Date Accepted:
Date Disseminated:
Confirmation # **1998112974855**

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

JAN 13 1998

INTERNET FILING

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

**96-45
1/13/98**

Sirs:

I am concerned with the proposal to assess per-minute line charges on users of the internet and wish to protest this assault on the future of free information. The internet has become the greatest source of information the world has ever known. Entire industries have been designed and built around it. The internet would not be what it is today if there had been a price levied on its use from the beginning.

Now, you propose attaching a fee to those who use this tool for business, pleasure, or research. My family's primary use of this invaluable tool for research. One user is in the middle of graduate school. Another is a brilliant (sic) grade school scholar. Another uses it primarily to research topical material for lectures and study groups.

The local phone companies seem determined to take two slices of the commercial pie: 1) They levy a normal charge to the ISPs for line use. ISPs, in order to provide adequate coverage for their clintele use and pay for the numerous lines required to provide that service. 2) Now, it seems, the phone companies are not satisfied with normal income; they want to be able to charge per-minute line fees on local lines already being paid for by the ISPs and their customers. Basically, they want it all.

If you give the local phone companies that right, you will be fostering the demise of the many small businesses we call ISPs. You will be giving all authority to control the internet to the phone companies - without any competition except for themselves. We, the American people, have already seen how that can work against us.

I end my protest with a line from an advertisement from not too long ago; "We may be the only phone company in town, but we try not to act like it." You've worked hard to eliminate this situation. Please don't create another!

RECEIVED

JAN 13 1998

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

Proceeding: **UNIVERSAL SERVICE** ☒ Record 1 of 1
Applicant Name: **Linda Hagen**
Proceeding Name: **96-45** Author Name:
Lawfirm Name:
Contact Name: **applicant_name** Contact Email:
Address Line 1: **PO Box 709**
Address Line 2:
City: **Washington** State: **MO**
Zip Code: **63090** Postal Code: **0709**
Submission Type: **7** Submission Status: **ACCEPTED** Viewing Status: **UNRESTRICTED**
Subject:
DA Number:
Exparte Late Filed: ☐ File Number:
Date Submission: **1/13/98 10:05:28** Date Filed:
Date Rcpt: **1/13/98 10:11:13**
Date Released:
Date Accepted:
Date Disseminated:
Confirmation # **1998113349287**

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

JAN 13 1998

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

INTERNET FILING

96-45

1/13/98

I am writing in regards to the proposed change in billing of ISP accounts to a per minute charge enforced on either the customer or the provider. I primarily use my Internet access for educational purposes for myself and my children. At the current rate I am paying, it is affordable. An increase in the rate would make it unavailable for use for my children, and many others who have limited or no access at their school. Thank you.

RECEIVED

JAN 13 1998

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

Proceeding: **UNIVERSAL SERVICE** ☒ Record 1 of 1
Applicant Name: **Dennis Dietzel**
Proceeding Name: **96-45** Author Name:
Lawfirm Name:
Contact Name: **applicant_name** Contact Email: **figdietz@iland.net**
Address Line 1: **Post Office Box 91**
Address Line 2:
City: **Smithton** State: **MO** ☒
Zip Code: **65350** Postal Code: **0091**
Submission Type: **7** ☒ Submission Status: **ACCEPTED** ☒ Viewing Status: **UNRESTRICTED** ☒
Subject:
DA Number: Exparte Late Filed: ☐ File Number:
Date Submission: **1/13/98 15:06:01** Date Filed: Date Rcpt: **1/13/98 15:34:50**
Date Released: Date Accepted: Date Disseminated:
Confirmation # **1998113959415**

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

INTERNET FILING

JAN 13 1998

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

96 - 45

1/13/98

Honorable Sirs: As regards #96-45, I wish to express my opposition to any wording of the laws and rules which would render and label my local Internet Provider as a "telecommunication provider." The 1996 Telecommunications Act has not benefited our family whatsoever, as far as making our telephone provider any more responsive as regards the total absence of optional services we receive. I live in a rural area approximately 5 miles from Sedalia, Missouri, where our IP is located and for which we pay \$18.95 per month in order to access the Internet. The only optional service our telephone company (Sprint/United) offers is called Community Optional Service, or COS, for which we pay a flat \$16.00 per month to call into Sedalia to access our IP. However, the Missouri Public Service has ruled that the telephone companies in Missouri are no longer going to be mandated to offer COS as of March 31st, 1998, which means that we will be forced to pay long-distance charges every time we connect to our IP. Our state Senator James Mathewson and other Missouri legislators are trying to have the PSC reverse their decision, at least until we are afforded "equal-access," just like the people in Sedalia, 5 miles away, enjoy now. At this point, we have no choice in local or long-distance carriers, and this poor state of affairs will continue for us, until the year 2000 AD, at least that's what Sprint/United has informed us. They also tell us that if they are not ordered to carry COS, they cannot promise us any sort of replacement service, which means that either we pay them long-distance charges to call our IP in Sedalia, or pay a per-minute charge to one of the long-distance companies, in our ATT, to access the internet using their '800' TOLL access number at .10 per minute, in addition to paying ATT's \$19.95 monthly charge. This state of affairs gives us absolutely no affordable way to access the Internet, offers us next to no choice in Internet providers, and if the status of our current Internet Provider, I-land, in Sedalia is changed to equal that of a 'telecommunications provider', we may as well kiss the Internet goodbye. Our rates would be increased to the point that if we wished any use of the Internet whatsoever, we would be obliged to use the long-distance carriers service, or none at all. I strongly feel that this action would put many independent Internet Providers out of business, which would mean that we would be forced to utilize the phone companies for the internet access, which is actually what the phone companies want in the first place. If the phone companies are not willing to provide us with digital access, or modern services as people in the cities already enjoy, they should not complain about businesses who attempt to give people the service they complain they cannot afford to.

As far as the charges the phone companies have to pay into the fund to improve and help the Internet connections for our public schools and rural areas, they ARE TELEPHONE COMPANIES first, and not Internet Providers. Our phone company is not interested in the least in helping with improved services, and only provide what the law MAKES them provide.

I strongly urge the FCC to oppose any type of renaming the independent Internet Providers as "telecommunications providers."

Thank you for your attention to this important issue.

Sincerely, Dennis Dietzel
viders

RECEIVED
JAN 13 1998
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

ARE telephone companies,

sence of optional services they do not offer us.